DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 878 FL 019 331

AUTHOR Dooley, Robert A.
TITLE A Double-Verb Construction in Mbya Guarani.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 37p.; In: Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session, Volume 35, p31-66, 1991; see FL 019 329.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Contrastive Linguistics; Grammar; *Guarani; *Language Patterns; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; Morphology (Languages); Phonology; Semantics; Stress (Phonology); Syntax; *Uncommonly Taught Languages; *Verbs

ABSTRACT

The double-verb construction in Mbya Guarani is described. In this construction, the second verb (V2) has a distinctive morphology. It is concluded that the construction, examined from several viewpoints (lexico-semantic, phonological, morphological, and syntactic) is a phrase in which V2 functions as a modifier of V1, and that is different from other constructions in the language, such as clause subordination and verbal coordination. On the other hand, it is seen to have much in common with serial verb constructions documented for the languages of West Africa, the Caribbean, East and Southeast Asia, and Papua New Guinea. A 24-item bibliography is included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353818

A DOUBLE-VERB CONSTRUCTION IN MBYÁ GUARANÍ

Robert A. Dooley

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dooley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

1 Introduction
2 Lexical and semantic properties
  2.1 Semantics of V2 roots
  2.2 Semantics of simple V2 stems
3 Stress
4 Morphology
  4.1 The V2 suffix
  4.2 Derivational prefixes
  4.3 Agreement
  4.4 Negation
  4.5 Tense, aspect and mood
5 Syntax
  5.1 Argument sharing
  5.2 Positioning of free arguments
6 Comparison with subordinate clauses
  6.1 Adverbial subordinate clauses
  6.2 Purpose clauses
7 Comparison with verbal coordination
8 Comparison with serial verb constructions
9 Concluding discussion
  Abbreviations
  References

1 Introduction

In many Tupí-Guaraní languages there occurs a particular type of construction involving two verbs (Jensen 1990:124f, 137ff). The second verbs in such constructions, traditionally referred to as "gerunds" in Tupí studies (cf. Jensen 1989, Lemos Barbosa n.d., Rodrigues 1953 and 1981), have distinctive morphology and, in some of these languages, form a closed class. The present study is a description of this double-verb construction in Mbyá, a dialect of Guaraní. I refer to the two verbs in such a construction as V1 and V2, respectively, a notation commonly used in describing serial verb constructions (SVCs). The reason for this choice will be explained shortly.[1]

FL019331

[1] Comments from John Clifton, Des Derbyshire, Cheryl Jensen, Stephen Levinsohn and Steve Quakenbush have been quite helpful in different versions of this paper. All of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In Mbyá, the V1-V2 construction is quite common in natural speech. In a corpus of different types of narrative texts which total approximately 1700 sentences, it was found in slightly over 10% of all sentences. An initial example is provided by (1):[2]

(1) kʷatsia a-ɛtsa a-Ĩ-ní
paper 1SG-see 1SG-be.located-V2
'I'm reading seated'

In (1), V1 is *ɛtsa* 'I see', while V2 is *aĩní*, corresponding to 'seated' in the free translation. (The label "V2", besides designating the second verb in the

---

its remaining shortcomings are, of course, my own. Although in general linguistics the term "gerund" refers to a verbal form used as a noun, this is not its sense in descriptions of Tupí-Guaraní languages. (An exception is Lemos Barbosa (n.d. no. 159 note), who suggests that the gerund in Tupinambá is a nominalized form; however, this is not borne out by examples cited.) Guaraní V2s cannot substitute for either nouns or adjectives. In an earlier version of Dooley 1990, I referred to V2s as "auxiliaries" or "auxiliary verbs". However, these terms are commonly understood to refer to verbs which "express the tense, aspect, mood, voice, or polarity of the verb with which they are associated" (Schachter, p. 41). Mbyá V2s do not regularly express any of these, although some have an aspectual usage (Sect. 2).

[2] Phonemic transcription is used in this paper. Mbyá has six vowels: i, ɨ, u, ɛ, a, o (~ [ɔ]). It has fourteen consonants: p, t, k, kʷ, ʔ, ɲ ([dʒ] preceding oral vowels), m ([ᵐb] preceding oral vowels), n ([ⁿd] preceding oral vowels), ŋ ([g] preceding oral vowels), ŋʷ ([gʷ] ~ [gʷ] preceding oral vowels), ɾ, ts (~ [tʃ]), h, β (~ [w] ~ [v]). Nasalization spreads syllable-by-syllable regressively throughout (roughly) a word beginning with a stem-final syllable which is nasal (having its vowel marked with tilde), or from any of the consonants m, n, ŋ. There is also progressive spreading of nasalization from stem-final nasal syllables to certain suffixes, including the V2 suffix. Thus in (1), *aĩní* 'seated, located', with -ĩ 'be located' as its stem, is pronounced [ã.Ĩ.'nĨ] (or rather [ãⁱ.'nĨ] when vowel glides are taken into account). Syllables are V or CV. Glides are not discussed in this paper. Stress is discussed in Sect. 3.

construction, is used in this paper to gloss its identifying suffix.)[3]

In this paper, the Mbyá V1-V2 construction is examined from various points of view: lexico-semantic (Sect. 2), phonological (in relation to stress) (Sect. 3), morphological (Sect. 4) and syntactic (Sect. 5). It is seen to be a phrase in which V2 functions syntactically as a modifier of V1. This construction is then compared and contrasted with others in Mbyá, namely subordinate clauses (Sect. 6) and coordinate clauses (Sect. 7). At this point (Sect. 8), it is compared with SVCs as documented in languages of West Africa, the Caribbean, Southeast Asia, East Asia, Papua New Guinea and in other Austronesian languages, as well as possibly in Yuman languages of North America (Redden). To my knowledge, however, SVCs have not been described in languages of South America. The Mbyá V1-V2 construction turns out to behave like SVCs in its semantics and in some syntactic aspects. However, in four respects it is grammatically tighter than stock SVCs: (i) the V2 has an identifying suffix; (ii) it has a distinctive, reduced agreement pattern; (iii) it is required to have the same subject and, if transitive, the same object as V1; (iv) the construction is virtually impervious to the occurrence of arguments between V1 and V2.

2 Lexical and semantic properties

In a V1-V2 construction in Mbyá, V1 can be any predicate that can fill a "main verb" position in a clause. The class of V2s, however, is a restricted one. Whereas in certain other Tupí-Guaraní languages the formation of V2s is reported to be a fully productive process (Rodrigues 1953 and Loraine Bridgeman, p.c.), V2s in Mbyá comprise a closed class.

2.1 Semantics of V2 roots

The class of V2 roots involve seven semantic areas. Five of these areas are represented by a single verb root from which V2s are formed; the other two areas have two verb roots each. These semantic areas and their associated roots are listed in Table 1:

---

[3] The abbreviations used in this paper are listed under Abbreviations at the end.

Semantic area	Verb root(s)
'stand; be in an upright position'	-ʔã̄
'sit; be located'	-ɪ̃
'be, exist; walk around'	-iko, -ɛko
'be, exist (plural only)'	-kʷa
'go'	-a ~ -o
'come'	-ɲu ~ -u
'lie; be in a prone position'	-ɲu ~ -u, -nõ

Table 1: Semantic areas and roots of Mbyá V2s

The two semantic areas with multiple roots are: 'be, exist; walk around' with roots *-iko* 'be' and *-ɛko* 'life'; and 'lie; be in a prone position' with roots *-ɲu ~ -u* 'lie' and *-nõ* 'lay'. (In addition, some of the roots vary in form according to the person and number of the subject.) All seven semantic areas in Table 1 have to do with motion, position, or being. With the exception of *-ɲu ~ -u* in the last line, all of the roots can also occur in main verbs (see Sect 4.3 for agreement):

(2) a-ʔã̄ tsɛ-ɾ-o pɨ
1SG-stand 1SG-EP-house in
'I am standing in my house.'

(3) a-mo-ʔã̄ tsɛ-ɾ-aʔɨ
1SG-CAUS-stand 1SG-EP-son
'I make my son stand up.'

(4) a-ɪ̃ t-ɛna pɨ
1SG-sit/be.located NPOSSD-place in
'I am sitting on a bench.'

(5) a-ɪ̃ tsɛ-ɾ-o pɨ
1SG-sit/be.located 1SG-EP-house in
'I am in my house.'

(6) a-mo-ɪ̃ aroi ʔoɲa pɨ
1SG-CAUS-be.located rice pan in
'I put rice in a pan.'

(7) a-iko aɪ̃i pɛβɛ
1SG-be now until
'I am alive until the present.'

(8) a-iko tsɛ-ɾ-ɛko-a ɾupi
1SG-be 1SG-EP-life-NR along
'I am walking around my place of residence.'

(9) ɲanɛ-ɾ-u ɲanɛ-mo-iŋo araka?ɛ
1+2-EP-father 1+2-CAUS-be DP
'Our Father created us.'

In (9) is found *-iŋo*, the variant of *-iko* which occurs with the causative prefix *mo-*.

(10) ɲanɛ-kʷai porã aĭ
1+2-be.PL well now
'We are getting along well now.'

In (10), the final vowel *i* of the verb does not occur when the root is followed by certain suffixes, such as *-βɛ* in (11).

(11) aβa-kʷɛ o-kʷa-βɛ oo pi
man-COLL 3-be.PL-more house in
'The men are still in the house.'

(12) a-a βa?ɛ-ɾã momiɾi
1SG-go REL-FUT far
'I will go far away.'

(13) ɛɾɛ-o βa?ɛ-rã momiɾi
2SG-go REL-FUT far
'You will go far away.'

(14) a-mo-no-uka tsɛ-ɾ-a?i
1SG-CAUS-go-CAUS 1SG-EP-son
'I send my son.'

In (14) is found *-no*, the variant of *-a ~ -o* 'go' that occurs with the causative prefix. The causative construction with this verb idiosyncratically includes the transitive causative suffix *-uka* as well.

(15) a-ɲu tsɛ-ɾ-o ŋʷi
1SG-come 1SG-EP-house from
'I came from my house.'

(16) o-u ŋ-oo ŋʷi
3-come 3.REFL-house from
'He came from his house.'

(17) a-mo-u tsɛ-ɾ-a?i api
1SG-CAUS-come 1SG-EP-son here
'I'm having my son come here.'

(18) a-ɲɛ-nõ tsɛ-ɾ-upa pi
1SG-REFL-lay 1SG-EP-bed in
'I lie (lay myself) down on my bed.'

2.2 Semantics of simple V2 stems

When these same roots occur in V2s instead of main verbs, they are often seen to have connotations or interpretations that are only peripherally related to their meaning as main verbs. This is illustrated in the following examples, in which the V2 stems include a suffix glossed 'V2', which is discussed in Sect. 4.1.

On one hand, the V2 *-ʔǎmi* often has the core meaning 'to be standing':

(19) a-puʔǎ a-ʔǎ-mi
1SG-stand.up 1SG-stand-V2
'I stood up and remained on my feet.'

It can also convey a connotation of being ill at ease:

(20) a-tsɪ̌-ma a-ʔǎ-mi
1SG-embarassed-all 1SG-stand-V2
'I was standing around completely embarassed.'

The speaker must actually be standing in order to utter (20), but it is also true that being in a standing position is associated with feeling conspicuous and ill at ease.

The V2 stem *-ɪ̌ni* often simply means that an action was performed in a seated position:

(21) kʷatsia a-ɛtsa a-ɪ̌-ni
paper 1SG-see 1SG-be.located-V2
'I was reading seated.'

But in an extended sense, it can mean that the action of V1 is uninterrupted:

(22) o-o o-ɪ̌-ni t-apɛ ɾupi
3-go 3-be.located-V2 NPOSSD-path along
'He kept going along the path.'

In contrast with (20), the position of the speaker need not have been seated in order to say (22); the expected interpretation, in fact, would be that he was walking. The element of meaning which is abstracted away from being in a seated position is uninterruptedness: one typically remains seated for an extended period of time and in a single loca*ion.

The stem *-ikoβi* is generally used to indicate that the action takes place over a long period of time, relative to the given circumstances:

(23) a-ma?ɛ̃ a-iko-βi hɛtsɛ
1SG-look 1SG-be-V2 3.ABL
'I looked and looked at him.'

Depending on the particular V1 and the context, *-ikoβi* can convey habituality of state or action:

(24) tsɛ-r-ɛtsãi a-iko-βi
1SG-EP-healthy 1SG-be-V2
'I'm keeping healthy.'

The plural stem *-kʷapi* means that the meaning of V1 applies uniformly to the group referred to by the grammatical subject:

(25) oro-βi-pa oro-kʷa-pi
1+3-rise-all 1+3-be.PL-V2
'We all got up well, with no exceptions.'

There is a frequent collocation of this V2 with the suffix *-pa* 'all' on V1, as seen in (25). Sometimes the suffix *-pi* is omitted from this V2:

(26) oro-βi-pa oro-kʷa
1+3-rise-all 1+3-be.PL
'We all got up well, with no exceptions.'

The V2 stem *-oβi ~ -aβi* 'go' does not appear to involve extended meaning. The action of going may either be simultaneous with the action of V1 (27) or immediately after it (28):

(27) iɲ-aiβu o-βi
3-speech 3.go-V2
'He went off talking.'

(28) o-moti-pa o-βi
3-close-all 3.go-V2
'He closed up everything and left.'

Similarly, the forms *-ɲuβi ~ -uβi* retain the meaning 'come':

(29) a-ɲɛβi a-ɲu-βi
1SG-return 1SG-come-V2
'I came back.'

In (29), V1 and V2 describe the same action. In (30), they describe two different actions which are nevertheless presented as a single event:

(30) o-ɲapukai o-u-βi
3-shout 3-come-V2
'He came shouting/He shouted as he came.'

The two stems *-ɲupi ~ -upi* and *-nõŋi* do not depart from their respective core meanings 'lie' and 'lay':

(31) tsc-r-a?i o-kc o-u-pi t-upa ɾupi
1SG-EP-son 3-sleep 3-lie-V2 NPOSSD-bed along
'My son was sleeping, lying in the bed.'

(32) tsc-r-a?i a-mo-ŋc i-nõ-ŋi t-upa ɾupi
1SG-EP-son 1SG-CAUS-sleep 3-lay-V2 NPOSSD-bed along
'I put put my son to sleep, making him lie down in the bed.'

In summary, then, V2s can furnish the following types of semantic information:

a. position or motion, according to the basic meaning of the root:
   1) describing the same action as V1 (19, 29, 31, 32);
   2) describing an action simultaneous with that of V1 (21, 27, 30);
   3) describing an action that follows immediately after that of V1, but within the same complex event (28);
b. aspectual information (22, 23, 24);
c. information of other kinds about the event or its participants (20, 25).

In each case, the V1-V2 construction presents what is to be interpreted as a single event. Information contributed by V2 about the event is commonly seen to supplement that given by V1.[4]

---

[4] Although V1 and V2 often describe the same event, there seems to be a syntactic or perhaps stylistic constraint which prevents the same root from being used for both verbs. Thus, it is considered incorrect (ungrammatical or bad style) to say:

* moka a-r-u h-ɛr-u-βi
gun 1SG-COM-come 3-COM-come-V2
'I brought the gun with me when I came.'

3 Stress

The V2 in Mbyá does not receive primary stress, but often has a secondary stress on the final syllable. These two levels of stress are indicated in (33) by " and ', respectively:

(33) a-βi"ʔa a-iko-'βi
1SG-be.happy 1SG-be-V2
'I live happy.'

This stress pattern, when considered in the context of primary stress assignment in Mbyá, constitutes phonological evidence that V2s are within the same phrasal constituent as V1.

Stress assignment in Mbyá works as follows. Roots have at most one syllable which can accept primary stress; for most, this is the final syllable. Grammatical morphemes typically cannot accept primary stress at all; enclitics, such as postpositions and subordinating conjunctions, are typically of this type. The stress group in Mbyá is of the type that, for French, Hyman (p. 205) refers to as a "sense group"; in Mbyá, it generally corresponds to a phrase which is a clause constituent. Within the stress group, primary stress falls on the last syllable that can accept it; secondary stress often is heard on alternate syllables counting back from the primary stress, as well as on certain multisyllabic enclitics that follow the primary stress.

This stress pattern can be seen in the following series of examples (considered as isolated utterances), which use the same indicators for primary and secondary stress that were seen in (33):

(34)	ta"mõi	'his/her grandfather'
	'tsɾa"mõi	'my grandfather'
	tsɛ'ɾaʔi'tsi ɾa"mõi	'my wife's grandfather'
	tsɛ'ɾaʔi'tsi ɾa"mõi ɾɛβɛ	'with my wife's grandfather'
	tsɛ'ɾaʔi'tsi ɾa"mõi ɾupi'βɛ	'along with my wife's grandfather

In (34), whereas the postposition *ɾɛβɛ* 'with' does not typically accept even secondary stress, the postposition *ɾupiβɛ* 'along with, following the lead of' does commonly accept secondary stress on its final syllable.

A comparison of (33) with (34) shows that the stress pattern on the V2 is like that on the postposition *ɾupiβɛ*. That is, a V2 is in the same stress group as V1. Since other

stress groups typically correspond to phrasal clause constituents, the V1-V2 construction behaves phonologically like a phrase.

4 Morphology

The present section describes different aspects of V2 morphology: the V2 suffix, derivational prefixes, agreement, negation and indicators of tense, aspect and especially mood. As illustrated in this paper, Mbyá is a language with a moderately high "index of synthesis", to use Comrie's term (pp. 46ff). That is, it is fairly rich in both derivational and inflectional morphology. Grammatical relations are head-marked: verbs show agreement with subject and object, and there is no case marking for nouns.

4.1 The V2 suffix

All full V2s in Mbyá have the suffix *-Cí*, where *C* is one of the consonants *β, p, m, ŋ, n*.[5] This suffix derives from elements in the proto-language as follows.

In Proto-Tupí-Guaraní the V2 suffix took the following forms (Jensen 1989:102, 1990:124):

*-a / following a consonant
*-ta / following the a diphthong of the form Vi
*-'aβo / elsewhere

The following morphophonemic rules applied in the proto-language (Jensen 1989, Rodrigues 1981):

a. the *a* of **-aβo* assimilated to low vowels:
   *-co 'go' + *-abo –> *-cooβo
b. the *β* of **-aβo* nasalized to *m* following nasal stems:
   *-manõ 'die' + *-aβo –> *-manõoβo –> *-manõomo
c. before **-a*, stem final *r* dropped and *b* became *p*:
   *-potar 'want' + *-a –> *-potaa
   *-moneb 'put' + *-a –> *-monepa
   *-jub 'lie; be in a prone position' + *-a –> *-jupa

---

[5] The word "full" refers to the fact that the V2 suffix can at times be optionally omitted, as in (26). Conditions that give rise to this omission are not known. The omission is, however, quite rare.

d. the stem-final vowel dropped when homorganic with the initial vowel of the suffix:
*-co 'go' + *-aβo -> *-cooβo -> *-coβo
*-potar 'want' + *-a -> *-potaa -> *-pota
e. stem-final high vowel became asyllabic:
*-apiti 'kill' + *-aβo -> *-apitiaβo

Then, as Mbyá Guaraní developed from proto-Tupí-Guaraní, the following vowel changes took place (Jensen, p.c.):

f. post-stressed *a* (of *-*a*) became *i*:
*-jupa 'lying; being in a prone position' -> -ɲupi
(ɲ is the realization of Mbyá of *j)
g. post-stressed *o* (of *-*aβo*) became *i*:
*-coβo 'going' -> -coβi

The derivation of each of the V2 stems, listed according to semantic areas from Table 1, can therefore be summarized as follows:

'stand; be in an upright position'
*-ʔam + *-a -> *-ʔama -> -ʔãmi

'sit; be located'
*-in + *-a -> *-ina -> -ĩni

'be, exist; walk around'
*-iko + *-aβo -> -iko-oβo -> *-ikoβo -> -ikoβi
*-eko + *-aβo -> -eko-oβo -> *-ekoβo -> -ekoβi

'be, exist (plural only)'
*-kuß + *-a -> -kuβa -> *-kupa -> -kupi
-> (innovation) -kʷapi

'go'
*-co + *-aβo -> -co-oβo -> *-coβo -> -cobi
-> (innovation) -oβi (~ -aβi)

'come'
*-jur + *-a -> -jura -> *-jua -> -ɲui
-> (innovation) -ɲuβi (~ -uβi)

'lie; be in a prone position'
*-jub + *-a -> *-jupa -> -ɲupi ~ -upi
*-noŋ + *-a -> *-noŋa -> -nõŋi

Thus, the variants of the V2 suffix in Mbyá derive both from the suffix in the proto-language and final consonants of preceding roots. From the innovative derivation of this

suffix in the case of *-ɲuβi ~ -uβi* 'coming', *-βi* is taken to be its basic form.[6]

4.2 Derivational prefixes

The stems of the seven V2s presented thus far can accept derivational prefixes, resulting in further stems. These derivational prefixes are *mo-* 'CAUSATIVE', *ɛro-* (*ɛro- ~ ɛr- ~ ɛno- ~ ɛn- ~ ŋwɛro- ~ ŋwɛr- ~ ŋwɛno- ~ ŋwɛn-*) 'COMITATIVE'[7], and *ɲo-* 'RECIPROCAL'. The following forms result (hyphens are here omitted to save space):

root	simple stem	CAUS-stem	COM-stem	RECIP-COM-stem
-ʔã	*ʔãmi*	*moʔãmi*	*ɛnoʔãmi*	*ɲoŋʷ ɛnoʔãmi*
ĩ	*ĩni*	*moĩni*	*ɛnoĩni*	*ɲoŋʷ ɛnoĩni*
iko, ɛko	*ikoβi, ɛkoβi*	*moiŋoβi*	*ɛrɛkoβi*	*ɲoŋʷ ɛrɛkoβi*
kʷa	*kʷapi*	*mokʷapi*	*ɛrokʷapi*	*ɲoŋʷ ɛrokʷapi*
a ~ o	*aβi ~ oβi*	*monoβi*	*ɛraβi*	*ɲoŋʷ ɛraβi*
ɲu ~ u	*ɲuβi ~ uβi*	*mouβi*	*ɛruβi*	*ɲoŋʷ ɛruβi*
ɲu ~ u, nõ	*ɲupi ~ upi*	*nõŋi*	*ɛrupi*	*ɲoŋʷ ɛrupi*

Table 2. V2 roots and stems, including derived stems

As noted in Sect. 2.1, there are two semantic areas having two roots each:

'be, exist; walk around': *-iko* 'be', *-ɛko* 'life'
'lie; be in a prone position': *-ɲu ~ -u* 'lie', *-nõ* 'lay'.

For each of these two semantic areas, the two verbs have a division of labor in producing derived forms. For example, in the "COM-stem" column, *-ɛrɛkoβi* occurs instead of * *-ɛroikoβi*; similarly, in the "CAUS-stem" column, *-nõŋi* occurs instead of * *-moupi*. Actually, *-nõŋi* does not have

---

[6] The form of the suffix varies among Guaraní languages. In Old Guaraní and Paraguayan Guaraní, the basic form appears to be *-βo* (Montoya 1876, Gregores and Suarez 1967:178ff). In Kaiwa, as in Mbyá, the basic form is *-βi*. In Chiriguano, the suffix does not appear to be used (Dietrich 1986, Jensen 1990.)

[7] Ina comitative verb, the subject causes the direct object to perform an action while the subjet also performs that action.

the causative morpheme, nor does it have derivational prefixes, only the root *-nõ* 'lay' and the V2 suffix *-ŋi*. But since this root is transitive, it is semantically parallel to causative stems in the same column. Stems in the "COM-stem" column are also transitive, while those in the "simple stem" and "RECIP-COM-stem" columns are intransitive.

Examples of the derived forms are as follows (see Sect 4.3 for agreement):

(35) tsɛ-ɾ-a?i a-mo-pu?ã i-mo-?ã-mi
1SG-EP-son 1SG-CAUS-rise 3-CAUS-stand-V2
'I made my son stand up.'

(36) a-ɲo-pi h-ɛno-?ã-mi tsɛ-ɾ-a?i
1SG-other-grab 3-COM-stand-V2 1SG-EP-son
'I picked up my son and stood up, making him stand up too.'

(37) tuɲa-?i guaimi-?i ɾɛβɛ
old.man-DIMIN old.woman-DIMIN with

o-pu?ã ɲo-ŋwɛno-?ã-mi
3-rise RECIP-COM-stand-V2

'The old man and the old lady got up together, helping each other.'

(38) tsɛ-ɾ-u a-mo-ŋaru i-mo-Ĩ-ni
1SG-EP-father 1SG-CAUS-eat 3-CAUS-be.located-V2
'I made my father sit down and eat.'

(39) moka a-ɾ-aa h-ɛno-Ĩ-ni
rifle 1SG-COM-go 3-COM-be.located-V2
'I took my rifle and went off uninterruptedly.'

(40) ɲo-ŋʷɛɾ-aa-pa ɲo-ŋwɛno-Ĩ-ni
RECIP-COM-go-all RECIP-COM-be.located-V2
'They all accompanied each other and went off together uninterruptedly.'

(In (40), the expected third person subject prefixes do not occur. Among Guaraní languages, Mbyá is idiosyncratic in not permitting third person agreement on any word which begins with *ɲo-* 'RECIPROCAL'.)

(41) tsɛ-ɾ-u tsɛ-mo-ma?ɛ-apo i-mo-iɲo-βi
1SG-EP-father 1SG-CAUS-thing-do 3-CAUS-be-V2
'My father always made me work.'

(42) kʷatsia a-ɲopi h-ɛr-ɛko-βi
paper 1SG-take 3-COM-life-V2
'I got the paper and had it with me.'

The stem *-ɛrɛko* in (42) generally means 'attend to, take care of'. With animate objects it is often interpreted as 'guide'; especially with inanimate objects, it often is simply interpreted 'have'.

(43) tuɲa-ʔi guaimĭ-ʔi rɛβɛ o-puʔã ɲo-ŋwɛr-
old.man-DIMIN old.woman-DIMIN with 3-rise RECIP-COM-

ɛko-βi
life-V2

'The old man and (lit., with) the old lady got up and each helped the other to walk away.'

(44) a-mo-ŋʷapi-pa i-mo-kʷa-pi
1SG-CAUS-sit-all 3-CAUS-be.PL-V2
'I made all of them sit down without exception.'

(45) tsɛ-r-o pi-ŋʷa kʷɛrĭ a-r-u h-ɛro-kʷa-pi
1SG-EP-house in-NR COLL 1SG-COM-come 3-COM-be.PL-V2
'I brought all of the inhabitants of my house as a group.'

(46) o-karu-pa ɲo-ŋʷɛro-kʷa-pi
3-eat-all RECIP-COM-be.PL-V2
'They all accompanied each other eating.'

(47) ɲaŋʷa a-mo-niĭ i-mo-no-βi
dog 1SG-CAUS-surprise 3-CAUS-go-V2
'I scared the dog and made him leave.'

(48) moka a-ɲopi h-ɛr-a-βi
rifle 1SG-get 3-COM-go-V2
'I got the rifle and took it with me.'

(49) o-ŋʷata ɲo-ŋwɛr-a-βi
3-travel RECIP-COM-go-V2
'They accompanied each other as they travelled.'

(50) ɲuki o-mo-atsa i-mo-u-βi tsɛ-βi
salt 3-CAUS-pass 3-CAUS-come-V2 1SG-DAT
'He passed the salt to me.'

(51) moka a-ɲopi h-ɛr-u-βi
rifle 1SG-get 3-COM-come-V2
'I got the rifle and brought it with me.'

(52) o-ɲɛβi-pa ɲo-ŋwɛr-u-βi
3-return-all RECIP-COM-come-V2
'They all accompanied each other returning.'

(53) kirĩ-ʔi βaʔɛ a-mo-ŋɛ i-nõ-ŋɨ
small-DIMIN REL 1SG-CAUS-sleep 3-lay-V2
'I made the child lie down and go to sleep.'

(54) tsɛ-r-ovai-ŋʷa tsɛ-r-ɛro-ʔa h-ɛr-u-pi
1SG-EP-other.side-NR 1SG-EP-COM-fall 3-COM-lie-V2
'My adversary grabbed me and made me fall down flat.'

(55) ɲo-ɛ-ŋʷa kwɛri ɲo-ŋwɛro-ʔa ɲo-ŋwɛr-u-pi
RECIP-ABL-NR COLL RECIP-COM-fall RECIP-COM-lie-V2
'The brothers grabbed each other and made each other fall down flat.'

With the exception of *-ɛrɛko* as explained in (42), V2 stems with derivational prefixes are compositional in meaning; that is, their meanings are the sum of the meanings of their derivational prefixes and their V2 stems (for the latter, see Sect. 2).

4.3 Agreement

In order to understand the pattern of agreement marking in V2s, it is necessary to know something of agreement in Mbyá main verbs, a category which includes V1s in a V1-V2 construction.

With main verbs, agreement follows an active-nonactive pattern, which is described as follows:

(56) a. Intransitive verbs are divided into two lexical classes, here referred to as active and nonactive according to the agreement paradigm they take. Active verbs generally designate events, while nonactive verbs generally designate states. This semantic description, basically having to do with aspect (Mithun), has apparent exceptions, however, so it is better to speak in terms of lexical classes.

b. Subjects of transitive and active intransitive verbs are indicated by the following set of agreement prefixes, here designated ACTIVE: *a-* '1SG', *ɛrɛ-* '2SG', *o-* '3', *ɲa-* '1+2', *oro-* '1+3', and *pɛ-* '2PL'. (The prefix *oro-* is also used to indicate first person subject and second person object with transitive verbs.)

c. Objects of transitive verbs and subjects of nonactive intransitive verbs are signalled by the following NONACTIVE agreement prefixes: *tsɛ-* '1SG', *nɛ-* '2SG', *(ʔ)i(ɲ)- ~ ɲ- ~ h-* '3', *ɲanɛ-* '1+2', *orɛ-* '1+3', and *pɛnɛ-* '2PL'. This set is also used to indicate possession in noun phrases. Free pronouns derive from these forms via vowel gemination.

Main verbs show the same agreement patterns in subordinate as well as main clauses.

It would almost be correct to say that all transitive main verbs show both subject and object agreement. However, there are two important exceptions. First, transitive verbs also have two lexical classes: those in which third person object agreement cooccurs with subject agreement (*a-i-kitsɪ* (1SG-3-cut) 'I cut him/her/it'), and those in which it does not (*a-ɛtsa* (1SG-see) 'I saw him/her/it'). Second, no transitive verb shows subject agreement when the object is first person and the subject is second or third person *(tsɛ-kitsɪ* (1SG-cut) 'you/he/she/it cut me'), or when the object is second person and the subject is third person *(nɛ-kitsɪ* (2SG-cut) 'he/she/it cut you').

With V2s, the agreement pattern is somewhat reduced in comparison with that of main verbs. Further, V2 agreement shows ergative-absolutive as well as active-nonactive organization. In particular, V2s agree only with the absolutive argument (with two exceptions to be noted shortly): intransitive V2s show subject agreement (from the active paradigm, since all intransitive V2 stems are lexically active), while transitive object agreement is from the nonactive paradigm. Examples (57) and (58) show intransitive V2s inflected for subject agreement:

(57) ɲa-puʔã ɲa-ʔã-mɨ
1+2-rise 1+2-stand-V2
'We rose and stood up.'

(58) ɲa-ŋʷata ɲa-ɲo-ŋwɛɾ-a-βɨ
1+2-travel 1+2-RECIP-COM-go-V2
'We accompanied each other as we travelled.'

With transitive V2s from the column "COM-stem" of Table 2, there is an object prefix. (By a general rule of the language, the epenthetic segment *ɾ* is inserted between a nonactive prefix and the comitative prefix *ɛro- ~ ɛɾ-*.)

(59) tsɛ-ɾ-u tsɛ-ŋopi tsɛ-ɾ-ɛɾ-a-βi
1SG-EP-father 1SG-get 1SG-EP-COM-go-V2
'My father got me and took me with him.'

One exception to absolutive agreement of V2s is the occurrence of the portmanteau prefix *oro-*, which indicates first person subject and second person object:

(60) oro-ŋou oro-ŋwɛɾ-u-βi
1S.2O-find 1S.2O-COM-come-V2
'I found you and brought you back with me.'

That is, by reason of this portmanteau prefix, subject as well as object agreement is indicated when first and second persons are involved as subject and object, respectively.

The second exception to absolutive agreement of V2s is that for transitive verbs in the column labelled "CAUS-stem" of Table 2, there is no real agreement at all: the third person prefix from the nonactive paradigm occurs not only with third person objects, as in (35), (38), (47) and (50), but first and second person objects as well:

(61) tsɛ-ɾ-u tsɛ-mo-pu?ã i-mo-?ã-mi
1SG-EP-father 1SG-CAUS-rise 3-CAUS-stand-V2
'My father made me rise and stand up.'

(62) aβa nɛ-mo-ŋaru i-mo-ĩ-ni
man 2SG-CAUS-eat 3-CAUS-be.located-V2
'The man made you sit down and eat.'

The reduced agreement pattern of V2s indicates that they are syntactically dependent on V1. This is further discussed in Sect. 5.

4.4 Negation

Verbal negation in Mbyá is indicated by means of an ambifix consisting of the prefix *na-* (*n-* preceding vowels) and the offglide suffix *-i*. While the prefix occurs at the beginning of the main verb, the suffix can occur at different points in the verb complex, in such a way that the material between the prefix and the suffix is interpreted as the scope of the negation. First consider examples (63-65), which do not involve any V2s, but do involve an adverbial modifier:

(63) aβa o-ma?ɛ-apo ɛtɛ
man 3-thing-do really
'The man really works.'

(64) aβa n-o-ma?ɛ-apo-i ɛtɛ
man NEG-3-thing-do-NEG really
'The man is truly not working.'

(65) aβa n-o-ma?ɛ-apo ɛtɛ-i
man NEG-3-thing-do really-NEG
'The man is not working in a real sense.'

The positive statement (63) can be negated in two ways: the first, shown in (64), indicates that only the verb *oma?ɛapo* 'he works' is within the scope of the negation; the second way, shown in (65), includes not only the verb but also the adverbial modifier *ɛtɛ* 'really' within the scope of the negation. This difference is indicated by the free translations.

In a V1-V2 construction, negation works exactly the same way. Consider examples (66)-(68):

(66) aβa o-ma?ɛ-apo o-iko-βi
man 3-thing-do 3-be-V2
'The man is working (over an extended period of time).'

(67) aβa n-o-ma?ɛ-apo-i o-iko-βi
man NEG-3-thing-do-NEG 3-be-V2
'It is not true that the man is working (and this description of him has been the case over an extended period of time).'

(68) aβa n-o-ma?ɛ-apo o-iko-βi-i
man NEG-3-thing-do 3-be-V2-NEG
'It is not true that the man has been working for an extended period of time.'

(68) could be true if the man had just recently begun working, but (67) could not.

Thus the scope of verbal negation is determined for V1-V2 constructions in the same way as for verb-adverb constructions. In particular, although negation does not always apply to the entire V1-V2 construction, neither does it show up clausal boundaries between V1 and V2.

4.5 Tense, aspect and mood

Verbs in Guaraní are not inflected for tense or aspect. There are, however, certain words or enclitics which convey temporal information and which commonly occur immediately following the main verb. In a V1-V2 construction, they typically occur between the two verbs:

(69) a-ɲo-pou βa?ɛ-rã a-iko-βi
1SG-other-visit thing-FUT 1SG-be-V2
'I will go about visiting people.'

In (69), *βa?ɛrã* is used as a marker of future tense. In the same position occur elements such as *karamoae* 'past tense, within the experience of the speaker' and *ta mã* 'to be about to (do something)'. The latter is a marker of aspect rather than tense.

Whether such overt markers actually occur, or whether tense/aspect information is inferred from the context, the V1-V2 construction is interpreted as having a single tense/aspect. This is consistent with the fact that the construction is interpreted as telling of a single (possibly complex) event (Sect. 2).

The same is true of the interpretation of mood, but there is more morphological evidence for it. For example, there is a distinctive agreement prefix, *ɛ-*, for the second person singular imperative in the active paradigm. This prefix occurs with V2 as well as V1:

(70) ɛ-ɲo-pou ɛ-iko-βi
2SF.IMP-other-visit 2SG.IMP-be-V2
'Go about visiting people.'

That is, the imperative mood is indicated morphologically on both verbs.

The optative mood has a prefix *ta-* ~ *t-* which precedes the regular agreement prefixes. When a V1-V2 construction is in the optative, sometimes only V1 has this prefix (71), and sometimes both verbs manifest it (72):

(71) kiɾĨ-gwɛ t-o-βi-pa o-kʷa-pi
small-COLL OPT-3-arise-all 3-be.PL-V2
'May all of the children get up (i.e., have good health).'

(72) kiɾĨ-gwɛ t-o-βi-pa t-o-kʷa-pi
small-COLL OPT-3-arise-all OPT-3-be.PL-V2
'May all of the children get up (i.e., have good health).'

Whether or not the optative prefix occurs on V2, the entire construction is interpreted as optative; there is no difference in meaning between (71) and (72). Thus, the V1-V2 construction as a whole has a single interpretation of tense, aspect and mood.

5 Syntax

The V1-V2 construction in Mbyá can be described as V1 (V2), where V1 is what I referred to as a main verb in Sect. 4.3, and V2 is an optional element. V1 can have a complex structure, including modifiers, valence-changing suffixes, and postposed verb stems, the description of which is beyond the scope of the present paper (see the introduction to Dooley 1990). The present study focuses on evidence that in this construction, V1 is the syntactic head and V2 is a dependent; in fact, it is a modifier of V1. The entire construction is on the phrasal level.

Evidence for this view is of different types. Lexically, the fact that V2 is a closed class (Sect. 2) is of interest, since "the modifier position ... can be restricted to a specific subcategory of lexemes, while the head position is fully open, ... subject only to constraints following from the semantics of the construction and the participating constituents" (Zwicky, 2f). Phonologically, the V1-V2 construction shows the stress assignment pattern of a phrasal clause constituent (Sect. 3). Morphologically, V2 behaves like an adverbial modifier in regard to negation (Sect. 4.4), and the construction has a uniform interpretation as regards tense, aspect and mood (Sect. 4.5).

In the remainder of this section, two topics are presented which further support the proposed analysis of the V1-V2 construction: argument sharing and positioning of free arguments.

5.1 Argument sharing

In a sample of 176 V1-V2 constructions in Mbyá, the following was found:

both V1 and V2 transitive	11
V1 transitive and V2 intransitive	57
both V1 and V2 intransitive	108
Total	176

There are no clear examples in my data of an intransitive V1 with a transitive V2. All examples presented thus far in this paper are either intransitive-intransitive or transitive-transitive. (73) and (74) illustrate the transitive-intransitive variety:

(73) pɛrata o-gata-pa o-iko-βi
money 3-spend-all 3-be-V2
'He went around spending all the money.'

(74) ha?e nuŋa pɛ-i-kʷaa pɛ-kʷa-pi
3.ANA sort.of.thing 2PL-3-know 2PL-be.PL-V2
'All of you without exception know that sort of thing.'

Further, V1 and V2 have the same subject and, if both are transitive, the same object as well. The latter is illustrated in (35), (36), (38), (39), (41), (42), (44), (45), etc. As a consequence, V2s in Mbyá do not add new arguments; their arguments are the same as those of V1.

If V2 is indeed a modifier of V1, then this type of argument sharing can be fairly described as agreement.

5.2 Positioning of free arguments

In Mbyá, it is often the case that verbal arguments occur neither in free form, as NPs, nor incorporated with the verb, but only as agreement prefixes. (More precisely, arguments are indicated on the most fundamental level by grammatical relations inherent in the verb, aided by whatever clues there may be from agreement, context, etc.) Of V1-V2 constructions with transitive V1s, approximately half do not have free objects.[8]

The free objects which do occur can logically appear in one of three places: before V1, between V1 and V2, and following V2. The order O-V1-V2 is seen in (35), and the corresponding V1-O-V2 construction in (75):

(75) a-mo-pu?ã tɛɛ-r-a?i i-mo-?ã-mi
1SG-CAUS-rise 1SG-EP-son 3-CAUS-stand-V2
'I made my son stand up.'

The occurrence of the object between V1 and V2 is quite rare, as is, in fact, the occurrence of other nonverbal constituents, such as locational adjuncts. Further, when a native speaker of Mbyá edits written material, such elements tend to get moved elsewhere. This suggests that in cases where arguments occur between V1 and V2 in natural speech, the V2 seems to have been added as an afterthought. Evidence from editing, then, lends weight to an analysis of the V1-V2

[8] No cases have been found of lexical objects incorporated with transitive V2s in Mbyá, although these are reported for Tupinambá (Rodrigues 1953:130).

construction as a phrase which distributes like a single main verb.

Of the remaining two orders O-V1-V2 and V1-V2-O, one might expect the latter to predominate, given that the pragmatically neutral order of main clause constituents is SVO (Dooley 1982). As a matter of fact, however, O-V1-V2 occurs about four times as often as V1-V2-O. The explanation of this is not clear. Two observations may be relevant. First, SOV appears to have been the earlier basic order for Mbyá and Tupí-Guaraní languages in general. Second, the association of V1 with O (head verb with object) may be almost as close as that of V1 with V2 (head verb with modifier).[9]

6 Comparison with subordinate clauses

The next three sections address the question: Can the Mbyá V1-V2 construction be identified with some more-or-less familiar construction type? Three construction types are surveyed: subordinate clauses, verbal coordination, and serial verb constructions. The answer in each case is that there are differences, but the V1-V2 construction appears to be closest to serial verb constructions.

6.1 Adverbial subordinate clauses

In some respects, V2s resemble adverbial subordinate clauses. For one thing, modifiers and subordinate elements are both dependent on a clause or a verb-headed phrase. For another, the basic form of the V2 suffix, *-βi*, is homophonous with, and has historically given rise to (Rodrigues, p.c.), the enclitic switch reference clause subordinator *βi* 'SAME SUBJECT'. The possibility exists, then, that V2s are a reduced type of subordinate clause having an adverbial function. This is ruled out, however, by differences of various kinds between V2s and adverbial subordinate clauses in Mbyá.

Phonologically, as discussed in Sect. 3, V2s in Mbyá do not carry phrase stress; main verbs in subordinate clauses often do. Of the three phrase stresses signalled in (76)

---

[9] Compare Lehmann's (1973) generalization on the level of typology, that modifiers are generally placed on the opposite side of their head from the head's "primary concomitant" (the primary concomitant of a transitive verb is its object).

with ", the middle one is on the main verb of a subordinate clause:

(76) tsc-ɾ-"o kati a-"a βi a-"ʔa
1SG-EP-house toward 1SG-go SS 1SG-fall
'As I was going toward my house, I fell.'

Further, the subordinating conjunction *βi* does not carry secondary stress, whereas the V2 suffix often does; see the discussion of (33).

Syntactically, verbs in subordinate clauses often have phrase-level arguments (subject, object, adjunct); the adjunct phrase *tsɛɾo kati* 'toward my house' in (76) is one such argument. V2s do not generally have overt arguments distinct from those in V1.

However, it sometimes happens that the occurrence of a V2 results in an argument that the V1 by itself would not have. In this regard, compare (77) with (51):

(77) moka a-ɲopi h-ɛɾ-u-βi tsɛ-ɾ-o kati
rifle 1SG-get 3-COM-come-V2 1SG-EP-house toward
'I got the rifle and brought it with me toward my house.'

The same sentence as (77) but without the V2 *hɛruβi* 'bringing it' would be anomalous, in much the same way as its English translation: *?? I got the rifle toward my house.* The adverbial phrase *tsɛɾo kati* 'toward my house' must therefore attach either to V2 or to the V1-V2 construction as a whole; if it attaches to V2, then V2 plus that phrase would need to be granted status as some kind of subordinate clause.

However, there are both syntactic and semantic considerations which suggest that phrases such as 'toward my house' in (77) should be analyzed as attaching to the entire V1-V2 construction. Syntactically, adverbial phrases that come in with V2s always occur following the V1-V2 construction, just as clausal adjuncts typically occur following the main verb when no V2 is present. In subordinate clauses, however, the typical order is adjunct - verb - subordinating conjunction, as seen in (76). Word order, then, suggests that the subordinate clause analysis is not appropriate for the V2 in (77).

Semantically, as noted in Sect. 2, a V1-V2 construction often presents two separate actions as one complex event. This is plausible for (77); a complex event of getting and

bringing would involve an agent ('I'), a patient ('rifle') and a locational goal ('toward my house').

Whereas V2s are limited to a small lexical class (Table 1), verbs in subordinate clauses are not so limited. Further, when stems which can occur in V2s do occur as main verbs in subordinate clauses and are accompanied by the subordinating conjunction *βi*, this element does not take alternate forms as the V2 suffix does. For example, the stem *-I* 'be located' takes *-ni* as its V2 suffix (see (21)), but is followed by the subordinating conjunction *βi* when it is the main verb in a subordinate clause:

(78) kʷatsia a-ctsa t-cna pi a-I βi
paper 1SG-see NPOSSD-place in 1SG-be.located SS
'I was reading while seated on a bench.'

Finally, it can be observed that V1-V2 constructions can occur in subordinate clauses. In this case, the V2 suffix and the subordinating conjunction both occur:

(79) a-ma?c-apo a-iko-βi βi tsc-kanc?õ
1SG-thing-do 1SG-be-V2 SS 1SG-weary
'I got tired from working constantly.'

This in itself does not imply that V2s cannot be subordinate clauses; subordinate clauses in Mbyá can, in fact, occur in other embedded subordinate clauses, with the two subordinating conjunctions juxtaposed. However, two such nested subordinate clauses have not been found with the same subordinating conjunction, whether *βi* 'SAME SUBJECT', *ramõ* 'DIFFERENT SUBJECT', or any other. It appears that juxtaposed subordinating conjunctions must be different.

6.2 Purpose clauses

Rodrigues (1953:126) gives three semantic uses of V2s in Tupinambá, a now-extinct Tupí-Guaraní language: to express an action simultaneous with that of V1, to express an action subsequent to V1, and to express a purpose for the action of V1. Only the first two of these are found with Mbyá V2s (Sect. 2); purpose clauses are encoded by other means. Because of the close association of purpose clauses with the V1-V2 construction, not only semantically but, as it turns out, historically as well, Mbyá purpose clauses are here examined in some detail.

The most characteristic type of purpose clause ends in *aŋwã* 'PURPOSE':

(80) a-ɲu api a-iko aŋʷã
1SG-come here 1SG-be PURP
'I came in order to live here.'

Purpose clauses often do not have the same subject as the main clause:

(81) a-ɲu api pɛ-kwɛra aŋʷã
1SG-come here 2PL-get.well PURP
'I came here in order for you to get well.'

When the two clauses have coreferential subjects and the main verb is a verb of motion, the interpretation of purpose seems to be common. As a result, the conjunction *aŋwã* 'PURPOSE' is sometimes simply omitted altogether, as in (82), or is replaced with a conjunction which is semantically more neutral, such as *βi* 'SAME SUBJECT' in (83):

(82) oro-o oro-ɲɛ-poã-nõ
1+2-go 1+2-REFL-medicine-lay
'We went for medical treatment.'

(83) oro-o oro-ɲɛ-poã-nõ βi
1+2-go 1+2-REFL-medicine-lay SS
'We went for medical treatment.'

When the purpose clause is fronted for focus, it must be followed by a subordinating conjunction, either *aŋwã* or *βi* (the latter possible with subject coreferentiality and a main verb of motion):

(84) oro-ɲɛ-poã-nõ βi oro-o
1+2-REFL-medicine-lay SS 1+2-go
'It was for medical treatment that we went.'

When the subjects are coreferential, the main verb is a verb of motion and the purpose verb is transitive, it is common to find a lexical direct object incorporated onto the verb in the purpose clause, with no subject marking. The direct object in such constructions is usually or always generic or nonreferential:

(85) a-a ta tatu mo-ʔa βi
1SG-go about.to armadillo CAUS-fall SS
'I'm about to go hunting armadillos.'

(86) o-o kaʔaŋʷi ɾ-ɛ ɛi ɾ-ɛka βi
3-go woods EP-ABL honey EP-seek SS
'He went to the woods to look for honey.'

(87) ɲa-a ŋʷira-ʔi aβi βi
1+2-go bird-DIMIN miss SS
'Let's go bird-hunting (lit., bird-missing).'

On the other hand, it is also permissible, in any of these clauses, to mark such verbs for subject agreement. Compare (87) with (88):

(88) ɲa-a ŋʷira-ʔi ɲa-aβi βi
1+2-go bird-DIMIN 1+2-miss SS
'Let's go bird-hunting.'

The construction found in (85-87) has much in common with the V1-V2 construction. In Tupinambá, in fact, such a construction included the V2 suffix, which in that language was the same as that of proto-Tupí-Guaraní discussed in Sect. 4.1 (Rodrigues 1953:130). Besides the absence of subject marking, a transitive purpose clause of this type has in common with transitive V2s the fact that it has the same subject as the main clause and contains no elements besides the incorporated object, transitive verb stem, and subordinating conjunction *βi*. No adjuncts are permitted, and, in fact, neither are conjoined objects:

(89) * a-a ta tatu, ŋʷatsu mo-ʔa βi
1SG-go about.to armadillo deer CAUS-fall SS
'I'm about to go hunting armadillos and deer.'

Examples like (89) are not attested.

On the other hand, this construction in Mbyá differs from the V1-V2 construction in four ways. First, the class of transitive verbs which admit this type of object incorporation appears to be an open class. Second, the *βi* which occurs is the subordinating conjunction, not the V2 suffix, as can be seen from its lack of secondary stress and lack of alternate forms.

(90) a-a ta t-ɛmi-ʔu mo-ɪ̃ βi
1SG-go about.to NPOSSD-NR-eat CAUS-be.located SS
'I'm about to go put some food on (i.e., to cook).'

In (90), the stem *-moɪ̃* 'put' (lit., cause to be located) is followed by the subordinating conjunction *βi*, not the suffix *-ni* which it would take as a V2; see discussion on (78). A third fact which distinguishes these constructions is that the purpose clause can be fronted for focus:

(91) ŋwira-ʔi aβi βi a-a
bird-DIMIN miss SS 1SG-go
'It's bird-hunting that I'm going' (in answer to the question, 'What you going for?')

A V2, by contrast, always occurs following V1. A fourth fact is that adjuncts occur much more freely between main verb and purpose clause than between V1 and V2 (cf. Sect. 5.2):

(92) a-a ɲcβi βera ɾ-o pi βoko ɾ-cka βi
1SG-go again Vera EP-house in bag EP-seek SS
'I'm going again to Vera's house to look for the bag.'

Thus, (91) and (92) show that the purpose clause has more syntactic freedom with respect to the main verb (clause) than a V2 has. In the present paper, this is explained by analyzing V1-V2 as a phrasal construction, whereas purpose clauses are actual subordinate clauses.

Hence, examples (85-87) and (90-92) do not involve a V1-V2 construction, but rather something in between that and an adverbial subordinate clause (Sect. 6.1); the latter have main-verb agreement (Sect. 4.3) instead of the above kind of incorporation.

In diachronic perspective, what seems to have happened is that as Mbyá restricted its inventory of V2 stems to a small class, purpose clauses of the most common variety were reanalyzed as adverbial subordinate clauses. A subclass of purpose clauses, however, retained a feature of the former V1-V2 construction. Specifically, when the subject is the same as that of the main clause, when the main verb is a verb of motion and when the verb in the purpose clause is transitive and has an incorporated lexical object, the purpose verb shows no subject agreement.

7 Comparison with verbal coordination

It is relatively simple to distinguish the Mbyá V1-V2 construction from two verbs in a coordinate arrangement. Consider the coordinate construction in (93):

(93) aβa βai o-ɲo-pi t-aʔi, o-ɲuka
man bad 3-TR-grab 3-son 3-kill
'The wild man grabbed his (another person's) son and killed him.'

The following points should make clear that this kind of construction is different from V1-V2.

a. the second verb, *onuka* 'he killed', has no V2 suffix and shows subject agreement, though transitive (cf. Sects. 4.1 and 4.3);
b. *onuka* is not one of the closed set of V2s (cf. Sect. 2);
c. the object *ta?i* 'his son' of the first verb *onopi* 'he grabbed' occurs commonly after that verb, and before the conjoined verb (cf. Sect. 5.2);
d. there is an intonation break before the conjoined verb, as well as primary stress on the object and on the conjoined verb, not just on the first verb (cf. Sect. 3).

Such evidence clearly distinguishes V1-V2 constructions from verbal coordination, although both types appear to have similar argument sharing constraints (Sect. 5.1).

8 Comparison with serial verb constructions

Whereas in earlier sections of this paper the V1-V2 construction was compared with other constructions in Mbyá, the present section compares it with a construction type that is attested neither in Mbyá nor in any other South American language.[10] Nevertheless, the Mbyá V1-V2 construction appears to be closest to serial verb constructions (SVCs) than to any other commonly attested construction type.

Unfortunately, linguists do not agree on specific characteristics of SVCs. Zwicky (1990), in an article entitled "What are we talking about when we talk about serial verbs?", gives the answer "Lots of things" (p. 7). The following description of SVCs is somewhat of a composite, subject to all of the dangers which that involves.

(94) a. The verbs in a serial construction (call them V1 and V2 in the case of two) are lexical verbs (Gerdts);

---

[10] According to Sebba (p. 213), SVCs "are restricted to a rather small subset of the world's languages, and to four geographical regions in particular: West Africa, the Caribbean, South East Asia and New Guinea"; there are also Austronesian SVC languages of Oceania (e.g., Fijian, Foley & Olson). Yuman languages of North America should possibly be added to the list (Redden).

b. V1 and V2 "they are taken by speakers as representing parts of one event" (Hopper & Thompson, p. 735);

c. "no ascertainable clause boundary exists between V1 and V2" (Foley & Olson, p. 47; Gerdts);

d. "negation, whether marked once or more than once, applies to the whole string" (Sebba, p. 87);

e. "if V1 and V2 can denote separate actions, then they must be interpreted as having the same tense/aspect/ mode" (Foley & Olson, p. 23; cf. Gerdts 1989; Hopper & Thompson, p. 734; Sebba, pp. 87f);

f. the V1-V2 construction is significantly different from a variety of other construction types, including adpositional phrases, adverbs, coordinations, purpose or result clauses, adverbial subordinate clauses and clausal complements (Baker pp. 514, 550; Sebba, p. 87);

g. the construction has no conjunction or any other marker of coordination or subordination (Gerdts; Sebba, p. 86);

h. the subject of V2 must either be the subject or the object of V1;

i. V1 and V2 have, between them, "only one overtly expressed (syntactic) subject" (Sebba, p. 86);

j. in an SVC, it is typical for the object of V1 to occur between V1 and V2 (Sebba, p. 212).

Correspondences with the Mbyá V1-V2 construction are numerous. They are here examined with reference to the statements in (94).

(94a-b). Mbyá V2s as well as V1s are lexical verbs which present possibly different actions as a single event (Sect. 2). Foley & Olson (p. 40) further describe SVCs in terms of an "open slot" which "may be filled by a large number of verbs drawn from a wide variety of semantic classes", and a "restricted slot" in which "only certain verbs or classes of verbs are allowed" to occur. "In general, all open slots precede all restricted slots in linear order." They then use semantic criteria to posit "a hierarchy of verb types accessible to the restricted slot" (pp. 41ff). Some languages, such as Kaititj of central Australia, only have

motion verbs in the restricted slot, with meanings like 'come' and 'go'. Other languages, such as Fijian, have these and also verbs of posture and position. These first two types are classed as "active intransitive verbs" having actors. Still other languages have, in addition to the above types, "stative or process verbs" having undergoers rather than actors, which are coreferential with undergoers in other verbs in the construction. Igbo of West Africa is a language of this type. Mbyá V2s are a closed class of verbs which correspond closely to the first two of Foley & Olson's semantic types. Thus, if the Mbyá V1-V2 construction were to be analyzed as an SVC, the language would occupy the same position as Fijian in Foley & Olson's hierarchy.

(94c-e). Syntactically, the Mbyá V1-V2 construction gives evidence of being a single phrase; there is no evidence of a clause boundary between the two verbs (cf. (94c)). This is based on facts regarding such diverse phenomena as stress assignment (Sect. 3), tense/aspect/mood (especially the latter, Sect. 4.5), argument sharing (Sect. 5.1) and positioning of arguments (Sect. 5.2). It is true that verbal negation in this construction does not strictly follow Sebba's prescription (94d), since the scope of negation can be only part of the construction. However, this is no different from the negation of a verb and its adverbial modifier in Mbyá (Sect. 4.4).

(94f-g). The Mbyá V1-V2 construction is clearly different from clause subordination (Sect. 6) and verbal coordination (Sect. 7), but V2 does show a distinct marker of dependence: the V2 suffix (Sect. 4.1). This suffix, along with the distinctive agreement marking shown by V2 and its agreement with V1 in regard to arguments, indicates that V2 is dependent on V1, quite possibly as a modifier (Sect. 5).

(94h-j). Descriptions of argument sharing in serial verb constructions vary; (94h) appears to be included in them all. The Mbyá requirement of coreferentiality of both subjects and objects (in the case that V2 as well as V1 is transitive) is stronger than any of the requirements posited for SVCs, and satisfies all of them.[11] However, the virtual

[11] The following are different statements of argument sharing in SVCs: "serial verb constructions are formed only on the basis of the same subject or the object-subject constraints" (Foley & Olson, p. 26); "V1 and V2 must share an argument: either subject/subject or object/object or both" (Gerdts; but she also discusses object-subject sharing); "either: the semantic subject of Vi is the subject of Vi+1, or: the object of Vi is the semantic subject of

absence of arguments between the verbs in the Mbyá V1-V2 construction (Sect. 5.2) is atypical of SVCs.

The Mbyá V1-V2 construction, therefore, has much in common with SVCs. On the other hand, there are points on which it differs from the better known kinds of SVCs: a distinctive V2 suffix, a distinctive pattern of agreement markers, coreferentiality of objects as well as subjects, and the virtual nonoccurrence of NP objects between V1 and V2.

Both Sebba and Zwicky state that, in many of the languages having SVCs, there is a paucity of morphology which "makes it notoriously difficult to find non-syntactic criteria for determining category status" (Sebba). Two kinds of category status are in view. First, one looks for evidence which will identify SVCs as opposed to other kinds of constructions, such as verbal coordination and purpose clauses (Sebba, Baker). Second, one seeks to classify known SVCs as either coordinating SVCs, in which the verbs are multiple heads of a single phrasal or phrase-internal construction, or else subordinating SVCs, in which one verb is head and the other(s) is(are) dependent (the classification from Sebba). In the case of the Mbyá V2, there is clear morphological evidence of dependence (Sects. 4.1 and 4.3).[12]

In a word, the Mbyá V1-V2 construction is syntactically "tighter" than stock examples of SVCs. This subsumes not only the morphologically clear dependence of V2 on V1, but

---

Vi+1" (Sebba); if V1 is transitive, its object is the same as either the subject or object of V2 (Baker). On a related point, Sebba (p. 122) claims that in SVCs, "an intransitive verb can appear after a transitive one but a transitive verb may appear in series after a transitive only". If that were so, the Mbyá constraint barring transitive V2s following intransitive V1s would certainly lend weight to identifying the Mbyá construction as an SVC. Zwicky, however, considers constructions like the English *Go see who's at the door* as a type of SVC (p. 9).

[12] The following statement from Zwicky (p. 8) is enigmatic in this regard: "Though many of the stock examples of languages with serial verbs lack the verbal morphology that would allow us to classify the serial constructions as subordinate or coordinate on the basis of the way finite and non-finite categories are distributed, it is generally assumed that serials look morphologically subordinate." It is not clear in what sense they could "look morphologically subordinate" in the absence of such morphology.

also its agreement with V1 in regard to arguments and in the virtual impermeability of the construction to arguments occurring between the two verbs. If an SVC is, among other things, a "combination of two or more verbal constituents which is problematic because it exhibits some properties of subordination and some of coordination" (Zwicky, p. 2), then the Mbyá construction should not be classified with prototypical SVCs.

9 Concluding discussion

The V1-V2 construction in Mbyá, under examination from various viewpoints (lexico-semantic, phonological, morphological and syntactic), is seen to be a phrase in which V2 functions as a modifier of V1. It is different from other constructions in the language, such as clause subordination (including purpose clauses) and verbal coordination. On the other hand, it has much in common with SVCs that are amply documented for languages of West Africa, the Caribbean, East and Southeast Asia and Papua New Guinea (and for other Austronesian languages).

The latter part of this paper (Sects. 6-8) is organized as if addressing a question of classification: Under which familiar construction type does the Mbyá V1-V2 construction fit? Specifically, Is this construction a "real" SVC? As Zwicky (1990) points out, however, given the syntactic diversity of SVCs and the lack of rigid and unified criteria for their identification, that question becomes spurious where borderline cases are concerned.[13] There are prototypical, or "historically faithful" (to use Zwicky's term) SVCs which are worth identifying as such, but there is little point in trying to classify borderline cases on the basis of present understanding.

Instead, another type of question could be asked, one which takes as its point of departure the observation that "most serializing languages are isolating" (Foley & Olson, p. 21), or at least, to use Comrie's term (pp. 46ff), they have a low "index of synthesis". That is, such languages tend to have little inflectional morphology; they use verbs instead of adpositions to code notions of location and motion, and they commonly rely on juxtaposition rather than tight syntax (Sebba, p. 214f). The following question, then, is of some interest: In a language with a relatively high

[13] "...there is no question here of deciding which examples are *really* serial verbs and which are just some other problematic type of V+V combination" (Zwicky, p. 2).

index of synthesis (such as Mbyá, Sect. 4), what kind of construction might be found which is semantically and functionally similar to SVCs?

One plausible answer would be: A construction that is syntactically tighter than stock examples of SVCs. Such a construction, for example, would involve multiple verbs, not with clause subordination, but likely with one verb serving as head and the other(s) showing dependency on it, quite possibly by means of morphological signals (e.g., distinctive agreement patterns and/or a marker reminiscent of subordinating conjunctions). Argument sharing might be more tightly constrained than in familiar SVC constructions, even to the point of becoming agreement. The construction might well exhibit other clear properties of a phrase, such as impenetrability to arguments; alternatively, it might have fixed positions in which arguments, especially objects, would occur. The construction would behave somewhat like a single main verb in its syntagmatic relations with other sentence elements, but its internal complexity might give rise to certain differences. The dependent verbs might be restricted to a small lexical class.

Most of these characteristics are found in the Mbyá V1-V2 construction, and of course were suggested by it. The point is not, however, to find a "back-door" approach so that the Mbyá V1-V2 construction can be classified as a type of SVC. Rather, it is to show that the Mbyá construction is indeed like SVCs in significant ways, but is grammatically tighter in ways that one would expect in a language with a fairly high index of synthesis. The question thus moves away from simple classification and becomes one of identifying similarities and differences with respect to a prototypical construction type.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABL	ablative
ANA	anaphora
CAUS	causative
COLL	collective
COM	comitative
DAT	dative
DIMIN	diminutive
DP	distant past
EP	epenthesis
FUT	future
NPOSSD	nonpossessed
NR	nominalizer
O	direct object
PL	plural
PURP	purpose
RECIP	reciprocal
REFL	reflexive
REL	relativizer
S	subject
SG	singular
SS	same subject
TR	transitivizer
V2	identifying suffix of V2 verb
1	1st person
1+2	1st person pl. inclusive
1+3	1st person pl. exclusive
2	2nd person
3	3rd person

REFERENCES

Aaron, Edna and Eunice Burgess. 1972. The verb phrase in Guaraní. ms.

Baker, Mark. 1989. Object-sharing and projection in serial verb constructions. *LI* 20.513-53.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology*, second edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dietrich, Wolf. 1986. *El idioma chiriguano: gramática, textos, vocabulário*. Madrid: Instituto de Cooperacion Iberoamericana.

Dooley, Robert A. 1982. Options in the pragmatic structuring of Guaraní sentences. *Lg.* 58.307-31.

_____. 1990. Vocabulário básico do Guaraní contemporâneo (dialeto Mbyá do Brasil), segunda edição. Arquivo Lingüístico no. 196. Brasília: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Foley, William A. and Mike Olson. 1983. Clausehood and verb serialization. *Grammar inside and outside the clause*, ed. by Johanna Nichols and Anthony Woodbury. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 17-60.

Gerdts, Donna. 1989. Serial verbs. Class notes. Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session.

Gregores, Emma, and Jorge A. Suarez. 1967. A description of Colloquial Guaraní. (Janua Linguarum, series practica, 27). The Hague: Mouton.

Hyman, Larry. 1975. *Phonology: theory and analysis*. New York: Holt.

Hopper, Paul and Sandra Thompson. 1984. The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. *Lg.* 60.703-52.

Jensen, Cheryl. 1989. O desenvolvimento histórico da língua Wayampi. Campinas: Universidade Estadual de Campinas.

_____. 1990. Cross-referencing changes in some Tupí-Guaraní languages. *Amazonian linguistics: studies in lowland South American languages*, ed. by Doris L. Payne. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 117-58.

Joseph, Brian D. and Arnold M. Zwicky, eds. 1990. When verbs collide: Papers from the 1990 Ohio State Mini-conference on Serial Verbs. The Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics, no. 39. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Department of Linguistics.

Lehmann, Winfred P. 1973. A structural principle of language and its implications. *Lg.* 49.47-66.

Lemos Barbosa, Pe. A. n. d. Curso de tupi antigo. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria São José.

Mithun, Marianne. 1990. On the "Split S"/"Fluid S" distinction: degrees of elasticity in agent/patient case systems. Paper presented at summer meeting of SSILA, Vancouver.

Montoya, Antonio Ruiz de. 1876. *Arte de la lengua guarani*. Nueva edicion. Viena, Paris.

Redden, James E. 1990. Serial vs. consecutive verbs in Walapai. In Joseph and Zwicky, 240-46.

Rodrigues, Aryon Dall'Igna. 1953. Morfologia do verbo tupi. *Letras* 1.121-52.

_____. 1981. Estrutura do Tupinambá. ms.

Schachter, Paul. 1985. Parts-of-speech systems. *Language typology and syntactic description*, volume 1: Clause structure, ed. by Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-61.

Sebba, Mark. 1987. *The syntax of serial verbs: an investigation into serialisation in Sranan and other languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Zwicky, Arnold M. 1990. What are we talking about when we talk about serial verbs? In Joseph and Zwicky, 1-13.